

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace FIG. 2C with the attached Replacement FIG. 2C provided herewith.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 12-17 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 12-17 are amended and claim 3 canceled. Also, the specification is amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Drawings

FIG. 2C is objected to because it is alleged that according to page 10, lines 22-25 of the specification the Dp0 is the same as Di0 and thus the value 50 in Col. B Row D should be 150.

In response, Applicants have corrected Fig 2C as suggested. Accordingly withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification is objected to due to various informalities. In response, Applicants have amended the specification as indicated in the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to the claims for various reasons. The objections are extensive and appear to address inconsistencies or confusing terminology within each of the claims.

In response to the claim objections, Applicants have amended the claims in many cases as suggested by the Examiner. However, other amendments have been made to the claims outside the suggestions of the Examiner in an attempt to address any confusions with regards to claim terminology and/or

features directed to the claimed invention. Applicants believe the amendments to the claims address the concerns which prompted the claim rejections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

§112, 2nd Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, within each of these claims it is noted that several claimed elements lack antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims address each of the issues regarding the specific features alleged to lack antecedent basis. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-4 of USP 7,034,788. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response to the non-statutory obviousness type double patenting, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b). With the submission of the terminal disclaimer, Applicants respectfully submit that the non-statutory obviousness type double patenting rejections is now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Application in Condition for Allowance

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Chad J. Billings

Registration No.: 48,917
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant